DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 980 RC 011 166

AUTHOR Nabokov, Peter
TITLE Implementing an Indigenous Community Education Program: An Interim Report.
INSTITUTION Human Resources Research Organization, Monterey, Calif. Div. 3.
PUB DATE Jul 72
NOTE 53p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adult Education Programs; *American Indians; Community Development; *Community Education; Educational Programs; Experiential Learning; Individualized Instruction; Learning Modules; Nonformal Education; Performance Criteria; Postsecondary Education; *Program Descriptions; Rural Population; *Self Help Programs; Tribes
IDENTIFIERS *American Indian Education; *Maine; Passamaquoddy (Tribe); Penobscot (Tribe)

ABSTRACT

Institutional success of an instructional model that featured peer instruction, a strict performance orientation, and an insistence on mastery of specific skills led developers to believe the same model could be used by communities to disseminate skills and information at low cost and with efficiency. The system was utilized in setting up an Indian adult education program for four rural communities in Northern Maine. The core of the program was the precisely written performance criteria for each of the learning models. A local master craftsman taught the skill to one student, the student practiced until he mastered the skill according to the criteria checklist, and then he in turn became the teacher and passed the information on to another. The "each one teach one" philosophy permitted students to work without pressure at their own pace, to learn in their own language, and to work with someone they knew and trusted. Each community determined what types of instruction it wanted; the learning models drawn up included such areas as basketry, installation of studding, insulation, wallboard and molding, legal rights, home maintenance and repair, and making children's trousers. Community response was favorable and the program considered highly successful. This report describes the program and how it was conducted, and lists job descriptions and functions of the program administrators. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165980

E6430
ADULT-ED

HumRRO

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Lavisky

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM"

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

RC 011166

This material has been prepared for review by appropriate organizational or sponsor agencies, or to record research information on an interim basis.

The contents do not necessarily reflect the official opinion or policy of the Human Resources Research Organization, and their preparation does not indicate endorsement by the Organization's contracting agencies.

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is a nonprofit corporation established in 1969 to conduct research in the field of training and education. It was established as a continuation of The George Washington University, Human Resources Research Office. HumRRO's general purpose is to improve human performance, particularly in organizational settings, through behavioral and social science research, development, and consultation.

Human Resources Research Organization
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

IMPLEMENTING AN INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM: AN INTERIM REPORT

This Interim Report has been prepared to provide preliminary information on the results of a research effort. It has been issued by the Director of Research of HumRRO Division No. 3. It has not been reviewed by, nor does it necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Director, Human Resources Research Organization.

July 1972

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
(HumRRO)
Division No. 3
P. O. Box 5787
Presidio of Monterey, California 93940

INTRODUCTION

Over the past few years a group of research scientists at the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) has been developing an institutional instructional model featuring peer instruction, a strict performance orientation and an insistence on mastery.* The model has had demonstrable success in a number of institutional settings providing not only performance mastery but enhanced motivation as well. The question arose as to whether the model could be used in and by neighborhood communities to disseminate skills and information at low-cost and with efficiency. An opportunity to answer this question arose when the Indian Adult Education Office of the State of Maine's Education Department sought assistance in setting up a program for four rural communities in Northern Maine.

Mr. Peter Nabokov lived in these communities for four weeks. His job was to introduce the model to the members of the communities, to "troubleshoot," to assess the potentialities for using the model in other communities, and to help participants to gain confidence in their own capacities to carry on on their own. His interim report which follows attests to his progress and his skill as a facilitator.

---

*A "layman's" description of the model as applied in this project appears in Appendix A. More complete and technical descriptions of the model and its previous applications can be obtained by request from HumRRO. (Reference: APSTRAT; Peer Instructional Model)

Part I

CURRENT STATUS OF MAINE PROJECT

Upon completion of my four and one half week stay in the Native American communities in Maine, the following conditions regarding the status of the performance-oriented training model prevailed:

A. On Indian Island:

1. A two-member community educational team, consisting of a full-time developer of instructional modules and a full-time coordinator, positions expressly designed for the Maine project. This two-member community educational team develops requested instructional modules and coordinates peer-instructional sequences to assist members of the community in transmitting knowledge they wish to share. (During June these teams were trained in the APSTRAT peer-instructional model. Each member received an average of forty hours of small-group instruction and practice. The teams have become conversant with the processes of breaking down the desired instructional material into a format for a sequence of single-session transmissions among community people themselves.)

2. A series of four training modules in Rough Carpentry has been underway since June 27. The team generated modules for each task (see Appendix E), installation of (a) Studding, (b) Insulation, (c) Wallboard, (d) Molding and Trim. About ten students have been scheduled to complete this pilot course by end-July. Meanwhile, the Community Education Developer is preparing modules in the same general area: House Maintenance, Foundation Masonry, Door and Window Installation, etc.

3. The youth community expressed interest in reviving the Penobscot language; one of the few remaining speakers would be the master. In addition,

they asked for peer-instruction modules in basic legal rights, how to behave in situations involving police and official agencies.

4. A series of modules on basic basketry techniques was requested during an early July meeting.

5. The community expressed an interest in learning communication skills for dealing positively with the frequently complex and frustrating negotiations between tribe and government or private agencies to comprehend incoming information and respond authoritatively.

B. At Pleasant Point:

1. A two-member community educational team, as described above.

2. At Pleasant Point, consumer education modules were discussed. Interest was shown at inserting the model into a new $200,000 OIC program beginning on the two Passamaquoddy reserves "to provide pre-vocational and/or skilled training for 150 persons" which promises to place 75% of them in jobs by April 1973. (This comprehensive adult educational effort would seem a natural for peer-instruction.)

3. Interest in developing modules in office education and secretarial skills.

4. A concentration on adult education needs related to the pre-occupancy phase of a community-wide HUD housing program. A coordinator has broken down the homeownership agreement into modular form for verbal transmission. She has written peer-instruction into a HUD proposal for training about 45 households in basic home maintenance--practical knowledge of plumbing system, electrical system, heating system, appliances, minor repairs and safety knowhow. Her developer teammate is producing performance criteria and procedural steps for these tasks during

sessions with the HUD subcontractor in preparation for the peer-instructional sequences. Her proposal incorporates the written materials generated during the Maine project (see Appendices A,B,C,D.)

C. At Peter Dana Point and Aroostook County:

1. As described above, the presence of two trained community education coordinators.

2. In Aroostook County, the coordinator is scheduling women for a peer-instructional sequence in making children's trousers. The coordinator has located a community-approved master (see Appendix B), arranged for meetings between master and her developer teammate, and is recruiting additional students.

3. The Pleasant Point Housing modules described above will have transferrable utility for the upcoming Peter Dana Point Housing program and, with modifications, for the Aroostook County Rental program. The Aroostook County Coordinator is also interested in using the model to transmit fresh uses of commodity foods. (Here, the master she located is a community member who can concoct meals from surplus goods which satisfy community palates, unlike the customary Department of Agriculture home economic literature.)

4. At Peter Dana Point, supervisors of two other federally funded programs have expressed interest in the model. The director of a bilingual program wants to explore its promise for disseminating a method for transcribing the Passamaquoddy language. The supervisor of a cooperative handicraft store has decided to use it to train young community people in retail store management.

Part II

COMMUNITY RESPONSE (a subjective account)

All exposed to the model seemed to find a particular facet attractive.

"That's what I like about it," commented a young Indian Island man, "that everyone can learn at their own speed. I always had trouble with that, talking a little longer you know; here I could take as long as I need and it's O.K."

To the women in Aroostook County, according to the coordinator there, "They liked the teaching in the home where they live. They have to stay with their families a lot of the time, and this means they learn there."

A young "militant" saw the model as a powerful device for developing tribal unity. "It gets the people helping each other, talking with each other on a personal basis, instead of all these frictions around here." On Indian Island, for example, the hot youth issue is this racial unity. A controversial traditionalist convention involving many tribes had just occurred prior to my arrival and the talk was of "getting ourselves together." I was interested that many of the most outspoken discovered this value in the model.

The opportunity to learn and teach in one's own language seemed a definite plus to members of the Passamaquoddy communities. Among the Penobscot, fewer than 1% speak the language; however on Maine's two easternmost reservations more than 50% speak their native tongue. The community representatives there, with whom the model's possibilities were discussed, visibly relaxed when they heard of the flexibility of the model in this regard.

Not enough actual peer-instruction occurred during my stay to assess the full motivational effect of the expectancy-to-teach dynamic. However, one student did offer, after passing a studding module, "You're going to listen harder, because if he goofs up, the guy you're going to teach, he's going to come back on you."

The model's adaptability in regard to timing, to length modules take to learn and teach, to accommodating to the pace of the community, and individual attention span, seemed limitless. We decided, in most cases, that it is best to structure modules around one to two hours for instruction, probably a little less to pass the performance criteria checklist. This also seemed a mobile time frame for learning situations where the context was a home kitchen or living room, and the only available time was night. I developed some bookkeeping charts (see Appendix B) which allowed coordinators to schedule modules for various dates, and reschedule them. One coordinator himself came up with the notion of making sure there were backup students for each beginning sequence after he lost a student one morning.

The functional context and performance criteria seemed sensible to everyone, and all seemed to appreciate that these requirements cleansed learning and testing of human partiality or equivocation. When a prospective student maintained he didn't have to go "through all that stuff" to learn something he already knew, the coordinators found it advantageous to say, "Fine, if you can do the job, go ahead and do it and we'll check you out and then we can all move along faster and you can start teaching somebody," in the words of an Indian Island coordinator. This phrase disarmed potential students who suspected their life experiences might be devalued by this new "school." (It is my observation that adults are touchy anyway

about being "instructed," and Indians, who have been bludgeoned by so many double-message programs--where the program says we'll help you, and the underlying message is that if you want to measure up, you sorely need help--are super-sensitive to any involvement which smacks of paternalism or cultural condescension.)

The apolitical nature of the system, its absorbability as a tool into whatever program or line of instruction found it an asset, was a great plus factor. It kept me from being a pawn in reservation power politics. I found it usually possible to diffuse resentment over the agency for which we were consulting because the model's ultimate worth obviously was unaligned to any of the "programs" which often arouse community suspicion and controversy.

The one-to-one privacy of the actual learning and teaching experience appears to be a critical and very attractive attribute. Coordinators liked it because they weren't being asked to place neighbors in potentially embarrassing situations where someone had to admit ignorance or error. It seemed to me that it made students feel they had a new authority, not a pretend power; the show was truly theirs.

The model seems to deal effectively with problems often associated with self-help programs. One of the ways native talent gets "burned out" by poorly conceived programs is to make teaching by community professionals a guideline and leaving it at that. This has come to mean that a master plumber or carpenter is asked to teach over and over again his skills, or, what occurs in reality more frequently is that he ends up volunteering his time to repeat minor tasks at the expense of his own professional and economic development. At both Indian Island and Pleasant Point, this was

part of community wariness. When it was explained that the model only needed the experts for the developing and priming phases of the instructional sequence and that pay for this period should equal what they would make on the outside, the coordinators were again relieved.

What permitted these flexibilities was the core of the model; precisely written performance criteria, where what is actually done--end results--is more important than how it is done, which is nobody's business but the peers. This seemed also to be another great attraction of the model. "No matter how I teach it to him," said one Indian student, "it's O.K. so long as it pans out according to this," and he held up the performance criteria checklist. Once or twice, an Indian Island student suggested a place where the checklist could use greater specificity, and it was written in. One man who thought he could pass a module without instruction tried, failed, and after working with his peer for a while said, "It is the simple things I find I can't remember." But interestingly, no students questioned the criteria themselves, perhaps because they were devised by community-approved experts--with an imported one, a student might respond, "Well, we don't do it that way here."

Finally, the system's principles insured it against becoming yet another program being done to the community. The people were ideally subject choosers--some problems with this will be discussed in the next section--expert identifier, and student and teacher. Community-based coordinators should only facilitate the meeting of those conditions. And through the quality control factor made possible by strict criteria, the system and the community exploiting it can verify its progress to the outside (i.e., funding agencies) with no reliance on verbal gloss.

On four or five occasions, I encountered people primed to demolish the system, probing it for weaknesses to validate their cynicism concerning any white-originated tool. They seemed surprised that the customary strings weren't evident and generally ended up being favorably interested.

Part III

FUTURE SUPPORT FOR MAINE PROJECT

Continued support, follow-up and evaluation are necessary before the independent usage and full potential of the model can entirely rest with the Maine Indian communities. (My departure from the Maine locations was not the first step in a "phasing out" schedule; toward the end of our training sessions the community representatives, particularly on Indian Island, were in command, tightening modules, making adjustments in training schedules, fielding community queries.) This subsequent support function should take the following forms:

1. The teams now in operation must have complete job security if the commitment and energy they have already demonstrated is to be maintained. This means equitable pay and fringe benefits for the taxing, analytical/organizational roles of developer and coordinator. (They are being asked to demonstrate the best traits of school teacher and community organizer combined, and should be paid commensurately.)

2. The team members need local administrative support. An administrator should be designated to produce clear directives as to latitude of subject material, freedom to choose and employ masters*, clearance for purchasing instructional materials and locating suitable functional contexts for training, and clear understanding of decisions they are being asked to make and others to be referred to administrator. (On Indian Island, the question of pay-incentives for students came up,

---

*We use the term "master" to refer to any member of the community who already possesses the skill, or skills, in question.

requiring a budgetary decision and a motivational one: how much would the students be paid and was it to be for the learning or imparting side of their participation?) The team needs assistance in reporting the results of their efforts. And where more than one team is operating in a region, the administrator must provide opportunities for reinforcing interaction, comparing experiences, and observing each other's progress.

3. HumRRO's subsequent role should constitute a working correspondence with both the community teams and project administrator. Since the clarity and precision of modules is essential to the model's utility--and it is a skill requiring much practice and revision--HumRRO must be available to critically review model materials when needed. This will cement the developer's precision and feel for what makes tight performance criteria. This critiquing function could be part of a retainer relationship HumRRO should negotiate with the Office of Education; at this point, the model can only be strengthened by this guidance. (This minimal support was urged by the Maine community developers and coordinators.) For example, a module prepared solely by the community (shown in Appendix F) though on the right track could greatly benefit from consultation and feedback from the HumRRO staff.

4. An on-site evaluation in about two months is required. But this visit should be part of the consultant phasing-out schedule, and provide an interpretative reading on the model's progress along with statistical summation. In-depth interviews with developers and coordinators are more significant at this juncture than quantity of pupils trained. Everyone has agreed that any adult voluntary educational involvement and movement would be indicative of success. Our effort during this phase must still be to maximize potential community

participation by strengthening further the educational teams' capabilities. The evaluation must explore problems encountered. Student reactions must be gathered, and actual peer-instructional episodes tallied. A refresher workshop for developers and coordinators then must be organized and led by the evaluator to focus on weak areas, creating new solutions and testing them.

5. The follow-up visit might well be scheduled for late October, when schools are well into session. During my stay, teachers queried about the system's value for their classrooms. This would be an auspicious time for developers and coordinators to run workshops expressly for school teachers and administrators. (They appeared ready for such a presentation when I left. Subsequent experience with the model can only make them more at home with demonstrating it and answering questions creatively.) An evaluation of <u>their</u> making the model community property properly involves critical observation of their role as its explainers/disseminators. Two to three months seems suitable for enough problems to arise, attempts to deal with them attempted, yet not too long for apparently insoluble problems to sap commitment before we can help.

6. At this stage in the Maine dissemination project, we must utilize follow-up not to merely consolidate gains but to explore the model's maximum utility for the Maine communities. (During my training sojourn, I detected a readiness for a premature red or green light decision on the model's applicability before I considered it necessary and before coordinators and developers could develop the confidence and expertise to imaginatively incorporate the model as a community resource. I felt this propensity burdensome on the trainee, and tried

to avoid it by asking everyone to consider the project an evolving pilot adventure requiring improvisatory, everseeing and sensitive support for some time to come.) This means that during the follow-up, continual exploration should be made to interest new community segments in the model, and follow through previously suggested uses such as the bilingual and retail store management programs.

At the same time, I would express a cautionary word here, prediciting that if these efforts meet any success someone might be tempted to make showcases of them before they have built sufficient strength. Ideally, outcome of valid educational movement as a result of the model will see Indians disseminating the model to other Indian communities. For the immediate future, however, I would be reluctant to ask Maine project leaders to hold any "briefings" away from the sites of their endeavors, where they have real things to show rather than experiences to explain.

Part IV

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER PROJECTS

HumRRO's involvement in the Maine project was motivated in part by the hope that the model would be a viable way for many local communities to begin to solve their problems of under-education and under-training indigenously. From the experience in Maine, the following questions and comments provide an overview of some of the issues requiring consideration in deciding whether or not a community might profit from adoption of the model:

1. Are there specific educational needs of the adult community; what are they and how have they been expressed?

(In both the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy communities, the prospect of yet another survey, conducted by the coordinators, as to what the community wanted and needed, discouraged the trainees. "We have been surveyed, polled and censused to death," a Pleasant Point woman told me. It seemed that the needs turned up by these surveys often differed from the kinds of educational experiences people <u>wanted</u> to participate in. To the coordinators, this meant they had to collect all pre-existing surveys of various agencies, check out needs through layers of small-group meetings, and consider carefully when a so-called community need came more from the imperative to keep a community program in operation than a desire from potential students who could bring motivation.

2. Are these training or educational needs the result of a program the community has entered into; is the potential pupil population to some degree "captive"?

(At Pleasant Point, the community entered into a housing program. Before the first five families move into their homes this winter, they must pass some pre-occupancy ownership competency criteria. Similarly, at Indian Island, the students for the Rough Carpentry modules were workers for Operation Mainstream--which hadn't felt it was performing its delegated training function sufficiently. In both programs, therefore, the voluntary nature of their participation was questionable. On Indian Island, this matter of mandatory training surfaced during a large meeting late in the training period. The Mainstream administrator thereupon made participation voluntary. In Aroostook County, on the other hand, the coordinator began a series of personal visits to people she knew and their friends, maneuvering patiently into the adult community. When she collected enough names, she organized small meetings to agree on a short-term task the people would like to learn how to perform. This latter method of peer-instructional recruitment is more time-consuming but promises deeper student investment and a better reading on the system's applicability.)

3. Who in the community has approved of the dissemination project, who is not aware of it, who disputes its worth?

(Halfway through the project, I ran into the governor of a community with whom I was working. He was understandably irritated at having no knowledge of my presence or activities. A nice man, he did not belabor the point. However, at other moments also my presence was made a mild bone of contention in pre-existant power struggles between government agency and tribe. The matter of who was consulted before community people were hired, where money was being spent, and which tribal leaders approved of it, all this provided a degree of tension.

It might have been diluted if I had been able to arrange early for small-group briefings of key tribal officials in the system. I emphasize several such working sessions rather--or along with--larger tribal-wide informational meetings because so often the big gatherings become stages for working out other conflicts. Also, the tribe should have material on the system, sample modules, etc., which can be handed around or placed in community newsletters.)

4. Who, working with the community, will occupy the role of administrator of the project and principal HumRRO contact?

(Throughout the Maine project, this role grew in importance. The administrator was forced to look after matters of job security, coordinator and developer activity reinforcement, and be the final decision-maker on budgetary matters. This role must also create an atmosphere where the local teams can improvise their way through confusions or obstacles, have the freedom, for instance, to create a simulation for a functional context when one is not available, and generally be available for advice and encouragement.

During the training period, another role was discussed: a community advisory committee to possibly take over some administrative duties--an already existing school committee could serve this function. It could approve on matters of model content selection, choice of community master, and be an asset in gaining community participation. To properly offer alternative means to best adapt the model to a given community's needs, it must know in some detail the arrangements already made to receive the system.)

5. What has happened with adult education and in-community training attempts before?

(In Maine, past adult educational efforts were not regarded highly, but it would have been helpful to have some indication what this exactly meant. Then potential motivational obstacles might be identified, what discouragements were common experience underlined, what styles and subject matters had been tried already, what constitutes a significant advance in this area, etc.)

6. Is the community willing to incorporate the model into new areas if it proves effective in the target situations?

(In Maine, the administrator encouraged a free-flow use of the model, bringing in the maximum diversity of community representatives to be exposed to it and consider adapting it. Perhaps my time was even too spread around re-describing its basics to interested newcomers. However, I would predict that the follow-up will benefit from this widespread exposure and offer still untried situations for the model's implementation.)

During the Maine project, it became clear there was no hard line between training and implementation. Once coordinators and developers were learning their jobs, the system was beginning. Then the question arose whether training should use community needs around which to illustrate and practice the skills involved in developing performance criteria, procedural steps, and use of the job activity guides for coordinator and developer. The other choice was to invent exercises which demonstrated what was meant by modules, criteria, steps, etc. Also, no criteria had then been established to ascertain when a coordinator or developer was ready to perform the required function.

In Maine, the question was answered by making the community's needs a core of the training sessions. Now we can draw up performance criteria for the functions of coordinator and developer to formalize the termination of the training phase of the dissemiantion experience.

Part V

OPTIMAL DISSEMINATION CONDITIONS

On the basis of our initial experience in Maine, we make the following recommendations for future model implementation:

1. Exploratory low-key contact visit, preferably not funded by the tribe itself. Disseminator visits with varied community representatives to explore scope of educational interests; makes evaluations along lines suggested in Part IV; reviews, with community representatives, peer-instructional materials developed for other situations; explores new materials needed to supplement training and implementation; arranges for candidates for coordinator and developer jobs to preview existing materials in preparation for training session; and roughly schedules training staging. (This final activity will occur where the common Native American situation is encountered of several distinct communities in one tribal region-reservation. In Maine, this meant I lost time backtracking to go over basics with new arrivals, which still would be necessary but more efficient if the first team had gained enough ground to make some independent movement meanwhile. The prospect of peer-instruction in peer-instruction arises here and would be most advantageous for all the same dynamics discussed in Part II.)

2. A four-to-five week training dissemination period to allow for coordinators and developers to experience surveying community educational interests and needs. The duration should be sufficient for the disseminator to be on hand during actual instructional episodes prepared and primed by trainees. The period entails generation of new materials, activity guides, experience in ways to choose and pay masters, negotiation with

administrator and/or community advisory people, and whatever improvisations and adaptations are needed to blend the model into the community pace and style. When appropriate, past modules and lessons from previous dissemination can be offered for their modification to the community need. (Among the Maine coordinators, the thought of exchanging valuable modules came early. Upon further discussion, it seemed that we might consider a module bank, a filing and duplicating center for peer-instructional material in a wide variety of basic skills and aptitudes. The modules in the Appendix suggest that versatility of this material, albeit with local modifications for each dissemination project.)

3. A working correspondence between consulting agency and community for interim period until phase-out. This low-level, supportive monitoring of the instructional sequences involves critiquing of modules and conferring on unexpected obstacles or needed changes. The correspondence should be between the consulting agency and both locally-based developers and coordinators as well as with the project administrator.

4. Follow-up evaluation/interpretation to back up the entire venture. This on-site visit is sufficient for project personnel to have refresher workshops of desired length. At the same time, data can be collected as to number of instructional sequences attempted, pupils involved, modules developed, drafts needed before final module acceptable, etc. It should include community reactions and interpretative description of extent of model application.

5. Funding arrangements with HumRRO should, ideally, be constituted on a continuing, retainer basis rather than on an episodic, single contract basis. As suggested earlier, it would be preferable if community education coordinators and developers could feel free to contact HumRRO

staff members at any time for clarification, feedback, etc. The arbitrary cutoff time inherent in single project funding is artificial and basically detrimental to the successful implementation of the model. Such a funding arrangement would, of course, have to come directly from a state or federal (HUD, O/E, ABE, etc.) funding agency and not from the localities themselves.

Other conditions would be the hiring of trainees who pass performance criteria on year-long renewable contract (criteria for a given team, not for developer or coordinator separately). Their salaries should be on a par with local grade school teachers; the same kind of accountability is being asked of them, and probably a greater degree of precision instructional planning.

The role of administrator should be occupied by someone able to devote roughly a fourth of their working time to making the coordinator and developer functions a viable, permanent adjunct to community self-development. Ideally, as I've suggested, a community advisory committee would oversee the project along with the administrator. Pay for masters should be on an hourly basis commensurate with their regular professional pay. If student pay is introduced as incentive, it should be for the teaching role.

Each dissemination experience should be followed by a status report after the original training period, an interpretative evaluation after the follow-up visit, and a journalistic description of the entire experience, examining where the target community's capabilities now lie in the adult education area, realistic assessments of obstacles to the instructional team's independent maximum utilization of the model, and suggestions as to further support functions prior to full-scale phasing-out by the consultant agency.

POSTSCRIPT

A return visit to Maine is tenatively set for October. If a working correspondence can quickly be regularized with the Maine project personnel, in the interim we can gather valuable information and provide the important supportive functions we have recommended for this stage of our phasing-out. We are highly encouraged by the response of the Maine communities and the progress of the project to date. As yet, no major obstacles loom to prevent our strong urging that further dissemination of this model be given the utmost support. We are confident that the data we collect in our follow-up activities will support this request.

Appendix A

INFORMATION SHEET ON TEACHING EACH OTHER

(An information, "lay" description of the HumRRO model distributed to all interested members of a community)

This is a new way of learning.

You remember in the old way you had to sit in a big class. You all had to keep quiet and listen to the teacher. You had to learn as fast as everyone else or you failed. You had to learn in English. You had no choice about what you wanted to learn. You couldn't talk with your friends in class or you'd get punished.

In this new way that is changed.

It works like this.

First, you and your community decide on the things you would like to learn how to do. Then someone in your community breaks down those things into little tasks. He is someone who can do the things you and the community want to know - he may be a carpenter, a plumber, or a basket maker.

That person sits down with someone, maybe starting with you. You have possibly known the man all your life. He teaches you the first of those little tasks. Since it is a little task, it will probably take you only a few hours to learn how to do it. But, you can take as much time as you need. The two of you work privately together. When you both think you can do the little task, you prove it. You prove it by <u>actually doing it</u>. If you can't do it yet, you work some more with the teacher until you can. You can try as many times as you need.

When you have proven that you can do it, you are the teacher. A friend or someone you probably know is your new student. You take as much time as you need to show him what you just learned. And he can take as much time as he needs to learn it. No one bothers you while you show him how to do what you just learned. Then he has to prove he can do it too. When he does, he starts teaching someone else. And you are ready to learn how to do another little task.

That is all there is to it.

This way you can work and learn in your own language. This way you can learn at your own speed. You work privately with a friend or someone you can trust. This way you <u>actually do</u> what you are learning, you don't just talk about it. No one bothers you this way. This way you never fail, you just keep on trying until you can do the task.

Appendix B

JOB DESCRIPTIONS

(Based on trial and error in Maine, these community jobs seem essential for dissemination and implementation)

COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL COORDINATOR

Job Description

General

Together with the Community Educational Developer (CED), the Community Educational Coordinator (CEC) constitutes a team whose purpose is to locate community members with expertise the community wants to share (or outside the community), break down that knowledge into units transferrable along peer-instructional principles, organize interested community members into an instructional sequence, and maintain quality control of the subsequent learning process.

Specific Functions

The CEC will be responsible for ascertaining community needs through pre-existing surveys, new surveys, or interviewing of community representatives. He locates community masters whose knowledge meets those needs, arranges for interviews between them and team, negotiates with community to clarify its educational wants and needs, organizes and briefs potential learners on the peer-instructional process, and acts as quality control once the instructional sequence has been primed.

This task entails:

A. Knowing the community well enough to tap existing community surveys, interviewing significant community representatives, and being aware of existing talents.

B. Recruiting community masters for (a) meetings with CED to break down instructional material, and (b) for pairing master with learner to start off the learning chain.

C. Recruiting learners and briefing them on this way of learning/teaching.

D. Acting as quality control supervisor by checking out learners on the performance criteria test when they and their teacher think they can pass it.

Summary

The Community Educational Coordinator sets up and begins the peer-instructional learning situation. He gets the master to his teammate (CED), organizes students and implements use of (a) performance criteria, (b) instructor's guide, (c) the procedural steps, and finally acts as quality control supervisor.

Personal Characteristics

A. The CEC should know the community and be able to work with it intimately on its own terms and be able to gain its trust.

B. The CEC should be able to understand the basic workings of the peer-instructional system so as to clearly and simply explain it to students.

C. The CEC should be able to work closely with the CED, sending back modules which are awkward to implement or performance criteria which need tightening.

COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPER

Job Description

General

Together with the Community Educational Coordinator (CEC), the Community Educational Developer (CED) constitutes a team whose purpose is to locate community members with expertise the community wants to share (or outside the community), break down that knowledge into units transferrable along peer-instructional principles, organize interested community members into an instructional sequence, and maintain quality control of the subsequent learning process.

Specific Functions

The CED will be responsible for helping the community clarify its expressed educational needs; then he will organize, break down, and sequence the instructional material into a form whereby it can be comfortably used by one community member to teach another.

This task entails:

A. Interacting closely with the CEC to assist the community in precisely defining its educational wants and needs.

B. Writing concise goals--that is, precisley what it is the community wants people to be able to do or to be able to demonstrate knowledge of after the learning experience. This is "performance criteria."

C. Interviewing community masters and locating outside materials in order to break down their knowledge into smaller wholes; manageable instructional units we call "modules."

D. Preparing a brief "instructor's guide" so each teacher can recall what he is supposed to teach so that his student can pass the identical test he passed. If necessary, the CED can also prepare a "procedural steps" sheet which details how the teacher goes about passing the module's material to the student.

Summary

The Community Education Developer refines expressed educational needs, breaks down instructional material into modules, writes up performance criteria for modules, prepares an instructor's guide and, if necessary, a procedural step sheet for the modules.

Personal Characteristics

A. The CED should have experience in organizing instructional material such as in drawing up lesson plans, writing "how to" instructions, etc.

B. The CED should be able to match the master's knowledge when necessary with additional material researched from outside sources: libraries, university departments, government and social agencies, consulting groups, etc.

C. The CED, while in early stages of module writing will interact closely with the CEC, should be able to stay out of priming and exercising quality control over the instructional sequence. This position requires someone who can deliver the mental discipline required to elicit precise educational goals from the community and, in turn, elicit precise performance criteria from the experts, and acquire a "feel" for what constitutes a manageable learning module.

COMMUNITY MASTER

Job Description

The Community Master is someone the community recognizes as an expert in his skill area. When the community expresses the desire to know something in that particular skill area, the Community Master is hired to do the following tasks:

A. Meetswith Community Educational Coordinator to learn about peer-instructional model.

B. Meets with Community Educational Coordinator and Community Educational Developer for initial session to break down community educational interest into smaller topics.

C. Meets with Community Educational Developer a second time to prepare performance criteria. These working sessions break down the things the community wants to know into specific tasks to be done.

D. Teaches the first student to do the test which he has helped create.

E. Stays available through first three passages of information to help change criteria if needed.

F. Is available to teach successive modules in the instructional series.

Appendix C

JOB ACTIVITY GUIDES

(A more detailed description of the activities of the community educational developer and coordinator)

COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPER

Job Activity Guide

This outline suggests the developer's duties and their sequence. It is only meant as a guide and not a rigid instruction.

1. When the coordinator brings to the developer the community's original expression of its educational wants and needs, the two start to work closely to clarify them. This initial work is crucial. It involves making the first contact with the community master whose skill area covers those wants and needs. With him, the team tries to break down the original expression of needs into specific areas. (If there is no community master, outside people, or material, will fill this function.) Part of the developer's role here is to give forth new ideas which come out of the community's original expression which is very likely quite general. The three work together to break down the area of educational interest so that the coordinator can return to the community and ask which sub-area it wants to start on. Example: The community says it wants leather crafts, but leaves it as broadly as that. The master helps the CED and CEC break down this interest area into such jobs as moccasin making, leather embossing, thong braiding, etc. Then they take this breakdown back to the community to ask which of these jobs they want their people to work on first.

This crucial groundwork involves: (a) getting the general educational request from the community; (b) the coordinator locating

a community master, or the team researching material on the interest area; and (c) getting the perfected request from the community: "We want our people to learn to do..."

2. Next the developer works again with the community master in sessions to produce "performance criteria." The developer here strives to answer the question: "What does a person have to be able to do in order to make...?" This is a process of careful, patient, step-by-step interrogation. It may appear that the community's request is still too general or not sufficiently focused.

As the developer works with the master, what must be performed to do the required job (make the required article) is separated from what's nice to know. All the while, the developer is taking notes of the master's outlining of tasks, and interrupting when a step seems to be skipped. (If it is agreeable to the master, this interviewing session might be taped to refresh the developer's memory and possibly discover gaps he has to fill.)

3. As the developer works with the community master, he is trying to also answer the question: "How does a person know when someone can make...?" The specific answer to this question is the "performance criteria," the list of specific actions which determine that someone can do the task which the community wanted its people to be able to do. The developer's work with the master allows him to break down the material he is receiving into small, manageable instructional units which "feel" complete. There are no universal criteria for these units, each situation will probably create its own standards for what makes up a useful module. In some cases, as in school classrooms or in training sessions where students have to stick around all day, such a unit might

be the material which can be comprehended, practiced and learned by an average student in a 5-7 hour period. In less structured situations, such as in a community where people have free time at odd hours, it might be tasks which can be learned in their functional context in 2-4 hours. This requires experimentation for each given situation.

4. The coordinator may want to sit in on these work sessions between the master and the developer. He has made the introduction between them and the master may feel more comfortable with him around, and his advice may be valuable. The two of them may have to help the master break down still further the skill area into specific tasks, but hopefully this second session can complete the criteria for a given module.

5. Where the developer is using non-community material to create instructional modules, the process is much the same. After researching material or locating outside human resources, he must still match the stated community needs to the material, have the coordinator return the breakdown to the community, and then break down the perfected request into smaller, organically-whole instructional units, and write them up as "performance criteria."

6. The developer should then have the desired task to be performed clearly stated and all the actions necessary to do that job logically and clearly written down. He then prepares the instructor's guide, which is merely a sheet that parallels the performance criteria sheet but reminds each instructor in the peer-instructional sequence to teach each step in the criteria sheet. (Examples are attached.) The developer also designs the criteria sheet so there are boxes to indicate whether or

not learners pass their criteria tests and with an indication of how many attempts the learner made before passing them. It may be useful, finally, for the developer to prepare a "procedural steps" checklist which tells the instructor exactly how to teach parts of the job to save time.

7. At this point, the developer has drafts of these sheets and goes over them with the master and coordinator until all agree on a version ready to implement. At this point, the developer may go on to prepare another module in an instructional sequence and also be prepared to further tailor the module he has just written if there are any problems once it has been tried out. Feedback between the developer, who remains somewhat apart from the actual instructional sequence, and the coordinator, who is priming it, is essential here, and sharing of observations and advice.

COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL COORDINATOR

Job Activity Guide

This outline suggests the coordinator's duties and their sequence. It is only meant as a guide and not a rigid instruction.

1. The coordinator must develop community contacts for discerning the community's needs and wants. Frequently, surveys have already been conducted and he need only compare various results, and with community help figure out priorities. These needs can be diverse, and once various community elements understand his function, he may become overwhelmed by needs. His job here is to figure out where to begin, what basic skills, for example, seem to be most urgently needed for a particular sector or the entire community.

2. Then the coordinator tries to locate local masters to match those needs. These are community people who have mastery of the skills the community wants to know. The coordinator makes appointments with these individuals, possibly people he has known all his life, and asks them if they will share their knowledge. They should be told that they will be asked to participate in at least two sessions with the developer and the coordinator, talking about their skill area and breaking it down into very detailed parts and steps. They should also be told that they will be asked to teach one member of the community who will then teach another, and briefed on the peer-instructional process and its paperwork. (Possibly the master could have a brief sheet to review his function in the process.) The master could be paid for this work, and will be asked to stay on hand through about three transmissions of the information from new teacher to new learner. This will ensure refinement of the module, for it may need to be returned to the developer for further work between him and the master.

3. The coordinator introduces the master to the developer and the actual work sessions begin. He must participate in the preliminary work session and will probably want to sit in on the subsequent module preparation. Once this work is over and all approve of a performance criteria draft ready to implement, the coordinator collects copies of the performance criteria, the instructor's guide, and starts to find a functional context for the learning to take place (probably prescribed in the criteria itself) and recruits students.

4. The coordinator personally visits each of the group interested in acquiring the given skill. He explains to them that this is a way of teaching where they will teach each other in a chain-like sequence

to the same test, that they can take their own time to learn, that they won't be graded, that they will learn wherever the task can actually be done--in the kitchen, living room, on a house being built, etc., and that they will be working in pairs as the process moves. He explains that it is not actually a test, but a proof that they can do the job by actually doing it, and he hands out copies of all the checklists and instructors' guides and explains their usage. Then he gives them some idea when the each-one, teach-one instruction will begin, and how, once they've learned something, they're going to have to teach it to a particular person. If he likes, he can schedule the actual sequence by name right then with the advice of the student to avoid pairing people who don't want to work together.

5. Then the coordinator gets the master to teach the first student. When both feel confident the student can do the task, they return to the coordinator, who has left them alone. During this period, the coordinator might, however, coach the two if they need it, saying that they both should feel sure about the student knowing the task before trying to pass the checklist, and that the student should remember that he is going to have to teach it to someone else once he passes the checklist, and suggesting to the master that he check out the student in practice sessions to the test. When both feel the student is ready, they return to the coordinator, and the student either passes or has to return and learn the part he messed up. The master here can note where his student failed, and when they're working together focus on them.

6. When the student has passed, the coordinator tells the next student in the sequence to observe this new teacher doing the task. This is merely

watching time, where the newcomer watches the new teacher doing the task until he feels ready to try learning it himself. Meanwhile, the master's job is over. When the new student does want to learn, both he and the new teacher work at it until both feel he can pass, and so on.

7. All the while, the coordinator must be on the lookout for problems with the performance criteria. It might be too broad, people might find they can pass it very quickly, perhaps they already know more of it than they thought and there is no need for that full module, or parts of it can be placed into other modules eliminating it altogether. Also, the coordinator may discover that the module requires an "entry level skill" which some of the student don't have (like being able to read instructions, or hammer a nail properly) and some prior modules must be drawn up or some other groundwork done to prepare people for the task.

8. The coordinator should keep records of each person's performance: the number of modules they have gone through, how many tries it took them to pass the checklist, and perhaps any comments students might want to make which could help make the module more effective.

9. The coordinator must also work with the developer to schedule the modules so that if there is a series of them, they are properly staggered. This is so that when one person learns a particular part of a basic skill, he doesn't have to wait before picking up the rest of it. It is wise to lay out on paper this scheduling and here is where the teamwork will be very supportive and helpful in cross-checking the timing that seems most suitable for the character and need of the individual community.

10. Above all, the coordinator should reflect the community's own style and pace and tastes in the content of the modules and also in their dimensions. These features must be built during the modular preparations as well as during the scheduling of the instructional sequence.

Appendix D

HOW TO PREPARE A MODULE - AN EXAMPLE

(A description of the steps taken in assisting a developer to construct instructional modules)

A Housing Authority was faced with the problem of training some people who were about to buy new homes. A requirement of the program was that these homebuyers learn about the features of their new homes. They were supposed to learn about the electrical system, the plumbing system, the appliances, and the heating system. They were supposed to end up knowing about the safety features of these systems, the safety features of their appliances, and how to keep them in good working order. They were also supposed to know what to do in times of emergency.

The supervisor of this housing situation decided to try to make some learning modules out of these requirements. First, he had a list of the various systems in the homes: electricity, heating, plumbing. He also made another category for the appliances in the homes.

Then he chose one to start with. He chose plumbing.

Under plumbing, he had to think what to put. He asked a plumber what someone should know who was going to keep their plumbing in good working order. The plumber said that first the homeowner should know the location of everything that involved plumbing. Then he should know how to turn the water on and off on the lines and how to provide maintenance of the plumbing system. The supervisor said he only wanted to know what people had to know, and be able to do, in order to maintain their plumbing system and keep it in good working order. He didn't want people to be concerned about becoming plumbers. He just wanted them to be able to take care of emergencies until a plumber could come.

Also, he might want them to repair some simple things, like putting in a faucet washer.

Together with the plumber's help, the supervisor made a list under the category of plumbing. This list was a breakdown of all the parts of the plumbing system. But each part had a wholeness to it. Each part could be learned at one time, and there was something the homeowner could actually do to prove that he understood how to find and maintain that part. This list was:

Plumbing

1.	Lines	- location and maintenance
2.	Toilet	- location and maintenance
3.	Outlets (faucets)	- location and maintenance
4.	Traps and clean-outs	- location and maintenance
5.	Hot water heater	- location, workings, maintenance

Now this list was made through trial-and-error. For instance, there was a question whether Traps and Clean-outs shouldn't be together with Lines. But, as the supervisor talked further with the plumber, there seemed to be too much grouped under Lines for somebody to learn it all at one time. Also, the nature of the problems associated with knowing about Lines and their shut-off points was slightly different than the nature of the tasks associated with using Traps and Clean-outs to maintain those lines. So, they were divided.

Similarly, the Hot Water Heater was added as an afterthought. It might seem, at first thought, to fall more into the Appliances family. However, its connection with Lines and shut-off points made the plumber want to put it under Plumbing.

Next, the supervisor had to decide which of these to concentrate on for the first module in the Plumbing series. He chose Lines.

It took four drafts to finally come up with a working module. It took that long because it was hard to keep remembering that the module was a list of things to be done and not just statements. For example, the first draft said that students should know the location of hot water lines, cold water lines, sewer lines, and water shut-offs. It also said that the student should know where to find the clean-out and traps, and should be able to change washers.

This was clearly too vague and unclear. For one thing, the clean-outs and traps could wait for their own module. The changing of washers would likewise fall under the Outlets category, and not be included here. But most importantly, the module did not require the students to prove in a real-life context that he knew the location of the lines and could actually perform the shutting-off functions. The criteria then had to be rewritten with greater specificity, instructing the student where and what he was to do, and making everybody involved--instructor, students, and quality control supervisor--work under identical guidelines where there was no possibility of confusion as to what the task consisted of.

So, finally, the third draft attempted to spell out what the students should be able to do. It read: student will locate on-site all exposed cold water lines, hot water lines, etc.

A second part to the module said that the student would locate all shut-off handles for those lines and be able to stop their flow.

Finally, the module included a local adaptation. It was to be used in a region with bitter winters. So, the final part of the module said that the student would have to identify water lines that might freeze and be able to install either insulation with rags or heating tape.

But, the module was still not specific enough. Someone who knew nothing about plumbing wouldn't be able to check out a student on the checklist. The tasks to be done still needed to be more detailed. So, the finished module required another draft. Here it is.

Lines - Performance Criteria

A. Student will touch on the site:

1. exposed cold water lines under kitchen sink, bath, wash-basins, toilet, tub, free-standing shower, in cellar or under house;
2. exposed hot water lines under, etc. (all above locales);
3. exposed sewer lines, etc. (all above locales).

B. Student will use shut-offs to halt flow from:

1. all cold water lines to bathroom, kitchen, and any other in-house outlets;
2. all hot water lines to bathroom, kitchen, and any other in-house outlets;
3. any house outlet by using main water shut-off.

C. Student will demonstrate ability to deal with freezable lines by:

1. touching all freezable lines in non-heated portions of house and outside uncovered lines;
2. insulating pipe properly with rags;
3. wrapping pipe properly with heating tape;
4. writing number of feet of dirt that line must be covered by to prevent freezing.

Now, this finished little module still could use some refining. It has not yet been tried out, but on inspection by the plumber it did seem to pin down the essentials that were required of someone who wanted to be able to provide maintenance of his plumbing lines. Most importantly, it satisfied what the supervisor wanted his potential homeowners to know.

Next, he wrote up an instructor's guide which he would copy and have each person use as they took on the teaching role. It was a

reminder to the teacher of what he had just learned, in what sequence, and what he was supposed to teach. It read:

Lines - Instructor's Guide

1. Show student all exposed cold, hot and sewer lines. Make sure he can identify them on his own.
2. Show student all shut-off points for those lines and the main handle. Practice with him on turning off flows by locating the proper shut-off handle
3. Show student all freezable lines. Make him point them out himself.
4. Demonstrate application of rags as insulation and heating tape.

Practice this with student until he can do it by himself properly. Adjustments may have to be made. The Quality Control Supervisor for certifying mastery of these jobs might need a Procedural Steps sheet in addition to the Criteria in order for him to be sure--since he shouldn't have to know himself how to perform these jobs--the student is doing it right.

Once this module was done and ready for implementation, the supervisor was ready to work with the plumber again and start to write up a module for the Toilet, or whatever other Plumbing sub-category he wanted to try.

****

For our purposes, I have had the supervisor in the foregoing illustration do the job which should be done by the Educational Developer. This Developer has the job of questioning the expert (the plumber) and writing out the module with its criteria.

Appendix E

THREE INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES

(The actual performance criteria and instructor's guides [procedural steps] for three rough carpentry modules developed at Indian Island)

STUDDING

Task: Student must measure, cut and nail two vertical studs into a given frame, one by straight-nailing and the other toe-nailing.

Performance Criteria:

1. Student must cut two studs to fit inside of frame:
   a. Studs must be squared.
   b. Studs must be flush at top and bottom plates.
2. Student must nail two studs to inside of frame:
   a. Studs must be at right angles to plate.
   b. Studs must be 16" apart, measured from inside of one stud to outside of next.
   (while on floor) c. Straight-nailed stud must have two 16-Penny nails driven through plates, with nail heads flush to 1/8".
   (frame raised in place) d. Toe-nailed stud must have four 8-Penny nails at each joint, two on each 4" side of stud nailed at angles into plate.
   e. Student must test studs with hand to test if solid.
   f. Student must check measurements, making sure distance remains at (2b).

Procedural Steps:

1. Cut Studs:
   a. Use tape to measure inner height of frame. Mark this length off on stud.
   b. Using square and pencil, mark off stud on two sides for cutting at right angles.
   c. Using handsaw cut studs at right angles.
2. Install straight-nailed stud:
   a. Use tape to measure and mark along top and bottom plate every 16".
   b. Each stud must be placed to right of every 16" mark.
   c. Straight-nail with two 16-Penny nails through top and bottom plate into stud to secure it.

3. Install toe-nailed stud:

   a. Repeat (2a) and (2b).
   b. Nail one 4" side of stud as close to 16" mark as possible with two 8-Penny nails.
   c. Nail two nails in opposite side, back to 16" mark.
   d. Use tape to check 16" distance from inside edge of one stud to outside of next.

INSULATION

Task: Student must cut and install properly three rows of insulation.

Performance Criteria:

1. Student must measure and cut insulation from roll.

2. Student must install insulation:

    a. Paper or foil backing must be facing room.
    b. Insulation must cover all from bottom plate to top plate--no studs must show.
    c. Flaps of insulation must overlap where two pieces are side-by-side.
    d. Insulation must be attached to side of stud. Facing room.
    e. There must be no large bulges in between points where insulation is attached.
    f. Staples must be all the way in.

Procedural Steps:

1. Make measurements from wall; apply to insulation:

    a. Use tape to measure from floor to ceiling, add an inch.
    b. Measure insulation to that length.
    c. Use square to mark off insulating for cutting.
    d. Using metal straight-edge, cut insulation with knife.

2. Installing the insulation:

    a. Use staple gun to staple insulation to top plate on side facing room.
    b. Pack sides of insulation in between studs to bottom plate.
    c. Staple flaps of insulation to side of stud facing room.
    d. Staples must be 4 to 6 inches apart.

WALLBOARD

TASK: Student must measure, cut and install one piece of wallboard around one corner of a window frame.

Performance Criteria:

1. Student must measure and cut wallboard:
    a. All cuts must be straight.
2. Student must install wallboard around window:
    a. Lightest side of wallboard must be facing room.
    b. Nails must be 4-6 inches apart.
    c. Wallboard must be within 1/4" from window frame.
    d. Wallboard must be flush with floor and inside corner of room.
    e. Corners must be squared.

Procedural Steps:

1. Outline window frame on sheetrock:
    a. Use tape to measure from corner of wall to outside edge of window frame.
    b. Use tape to measure from floor to bottom of window frame.
    c. Use tape to measure eight feet from floor up on vertical stud.
    d. Then measure down from eight-foot mark to top of window frame.
2. Cut wallboard:
    a. Use chalk line to mark measurements taken from room onto wallboard.
    b. Use sheetrock knife to cut wallboard.
3. Install wallboard:
    a. Nail sheetrock nails into studding, 4-6 inches apart, and into plates.
    b. Check that all corners are squared.

Appendix F

RUNNING A STORE: AN INSTRUCTIONAL MODULE

(An example of a module designed entirely by community members before revision and modification)

TASK: Student must procure goods, price them, keep records and files, be able to sell goods, and advertise and display goods.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA:

1. Student must be able to keep records and files:
   a. must maintain a chronological correspondence file throughout the entire module,
   b. must be able to work with a card file of all items in stock
   c. must correctly file orders pending, orders received, and paid bills
   d. must make out a bill correctly.
2. Student must be able to procure goods:
   a. must make out orders for goods
   b. must receive goods, check packing slip for accuracy and store goods.
3. Student must be able to price items correctly:
   a. must compute cost per item
   b. must establish retail prices.
4. Student must know the proper methods of selling items:
   a. must greet the customers courteously and assist them in making selections
   b. must make out an itemized sales slip
   c. must receive payment and make change correctly
   d. must balance cash with sales slip.
5. Student must advertise, display, and store goods:
   a. must arrange items for display and sale
   b. must place excess items in proper storage places.

PROCEDURAL STEPS:

1. Become familiar with files and make out a bill:

   a. maintain a daily personal file in chronological order, containing daily comments and all information used throughout the module
   b. locate one item in stock in the store from the card file. Item will be specified.
   c. file one order pending, one order received, and one paid bill in own personal file. This is done in chronological order.
   d. make out a bill. The items will be specified:

      (1) use a bill form
      (2) itemize charges in chronological order. Charges are made by vocational students only.
      (3) find total price of charged items
      (4) send original to person(s)
      (5) keep copy for files.

2. Receive and check goods:

   a. select items to be ordered
   b. check catalog number for accuracy
   c. make out list of the fifteen items specified. The items are three of the following:

      leather
      beads
      yarn
      lacing
      seats
      15 items total

   d. note prices for each individual item
   e. note price for all items combined
   f. send the original to the company
   g. make a copy for the store files and file with orders pending
   h. when the goods are received, the packing slip should correspond to the order sent in
   i. store goods in the proper places.

3. Establish the retail price:

   a. the cost per item is to be found in the catalog or in the file copy of the order
   b. the pricing should be done as soon as the shipment is received
   c. wholesale price is the catalog price
   d. retail price is the catalog price plus 10% of the catalog price
   e. to find the retail price:

      Wholesale price
      x .10
      amount of markup

Then add this ANSWER to the total wholesale price. This is the retail price.

4. Show proper methods of salesmanship:

    a. be available for customer assistance
    b. make out itemized sales slip:

        (1) use sales slip with carbon copy
        (2) specify catalog number, description, and correct price of item, along with the date of purchase on the sales slip
        (3) total the prices of the items
        (4) give the copy to the customer and keep the original for the files
        (5) file the original sales slip correctly.

    c. balance cash with sales slip:

        (1) take total sales slips of the day
        (2) count the cash
        (3) they should correspond if correct
        (4) this must be done daily.

5. Advertise, display and store goods:

    a. arrange items for display and sale, making sure the price tags are showing
    b. have only one item on display and store all others like it in their proper storage places.